

system as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's assertion. For example, Bhargava fails to disclose a plurality of electronic devices (see Bhargava, Fig 1). Figure 1 of Bhargava illustrates a host system 100 connected to one wireless device 104. Although Bhargava discloses that host system 100 is capable of handling a plurality of email accounts, it is not inherent that these email accounts are associated with multiple electronic devices (see Bhargava, Col. 6, lines 19-20). Moreover, Bhargava discloses that the multiple email accounts are forwarded to only one wireless device 104 (see Bhargava, Col. 6, lines 29-39).

In addition, Bhargava fails to disclose a first determination system, a second determination system and a processing system as recited in claim 1. For example, all of the decisions relating to whether the email address is directed to wireless device 104 is performed by host system 100 and not the wireless device 104 (see Bhargava, Col. 6, lines 29-39). Claim 1 recites that each of the plurality of electronic devices includes a first determination system, a second determination system and a processing system. Because host system 100 determines whether the email address is directed to wireless device 104, these systems are included in host system 100 and not wireless device 104.

Lazaridis fails to remedy the deficiencies of Bhargava. For example, as previously discussed in the response filed on October 15, 2008, Lazaridis discloses a system that only has a desktop computer 10 and a mobile computer 24. Lazaridis fails to disclose or suggest both a mail server and a plurality of electronic devices that share a common email address, with the server receiving an email before the email is forwarded to any of the electronic devices. For example, if the Office Action asserts that the desktop computer 10 corresponds to the recited server, then Lazaridis does not disclose a plurality of electronic devices. On the other hand, if the Office Action is asserting that the desktop computer 10 corresponds to one

of the plurality of electronic devices, then Lazaridis does not disclose a server that is forwarding an email to an appropriate electronic device.

In addition, Lazaridis fails to disclose that mobile computer 24 has a determination system that "determines whether the e-mail message addressed to the predetermined common e-mail address is directed to the electronic device to which said second determination system belongs." The redirection software 12 disclosed by Lazaridis determines what other devices should receive the email message (see Lazaridis, Col. 7, lines 45-55). Redirection software 12 does not belong to these other devices. This is different from determining whether the common e-mail address is directed to the electronic device to which said second determination system belongs. Therefore, Lazaridis fails to disclose that each of the plurality of electronic devices includes a second determination system as recited in claim 1 and fails to remedy the deficiencies of Bhargava.

Independent claims 13, 21-23, 27 and 28 recite feature similar to independent claim 1. Therefore, these independent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1, as well as for the additional features these claims recite.

Dependant claims 2-12, 14-20, 24-26 and 29-31 depend from independent claims 1, 13 and 23 respectively. Therefore, these dependent claims are patentable at least for their dependencies on claims 1, 13 and 23 respectively, as well as for the additional features these claims recite.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests the rejections to be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven D. Jinks
Registration No. 62,760

JAO:SDJ/bab

Date: May 8, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--